DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 752 LI 002 986

AUTHOR Wingate, Henry W.
TITLE Cataloging--In--Publication: Problems and Prospects.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 15p.; (18 References)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging, *Libraries, *Library Services, *Library Technical Processes, Problems, *Publishing Industry
IDENTIFIERS *Cataloging In Source, Library of Congress

ABSTRACT

The interest in cataloging-in-source was revived during the twentieth century, with the most important experiment being that of the Library of Congress which concluded the program could not be justified from the viewpoint of financing, technical considerations or utility. A new program has been developed which poses many problems and has far-reaching implications for all libraries. The largest problem is that of cooperation with individual publishers. The publishers, the Library of Congress, and the libraries which will use the entries must all cooperate and find a program consistent with their individual objectives, and many of the inevitable programs must be identified as early as possible if the program is to succeed. A more critical attitude on the part of those involved and a more objective examination of the problems are also required to ensure success. (AB)

ED053752

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

By

Henry W. Wingate

1971

When the Library of Congress issued its very negative report in 1960 on the Cataloging-in-Source program it was generally felt that the century-old idea of a system which would provide for the printing of cataloging information in each individual book as published was at last dead. The idea had first been suggested in 1876 and had been experimented with during the late 1870's. By 1880, however, the experiments had ceased due to a general lack of interest.[1] During the twentieth century the concept has been frequently revived, and projects similar to Cataloging-in-Source have been undertaken in Australia, New Zealand, the Soviet Union and the United States. By far, the most important experiment was the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source program carried out by the Library of Congress. In an eight-month period from July, 1958, to February, 1959, the Library of Congress cataloged 1,203 books before publication, using page proofs sent to the Library by publishers. The cataloging entries were returned with the proofs to the publishers, and the entries appeared printed in each copy of 1,082 of the 1,203 titles cataloged. The entry generally appeared on the verso of the title page in the form of a facsimile of a Library of Congress card. In 1960 the Library issued its conclusions concerning the program in a 199-page report.[2] Based on the eight-month experiment, it was decided that

> the over-all conclusion seems inescapable that a permanent, full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program could not be justified from the viewpoint of financing, technical considerations, or utility.... In the light of the experience gained through the experiment, it is concluded that neither a full nor a partial Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable.... There should be no futher experiments with Cataloging-in-Source.[3]

LI 002 986

The failure of the project was so conclusive that it appeared the idea had been dealt a deathblow. In truth, it had only been stunned. The concept remained dormant for nine years, and then in 1969 it was revived in what appears to have been an almost spontaneous plea on the part of librarians for a new program. The revival rapidly gained momentum, and in two years has led to the current Cataloging-in-Publication program. The optimism accompanying the new program might seem curious in light of the failures of such projects in the past. There has been some feeling among librarians, however, that the 1958-59 CIS program was not given every chance for survival by the Library of Congress. It has been pointed out that the inadequate funding and the limited number of books cataloged invalidate the conclusions reached by the Library. Be that as it may, there is a new program which poses many problems and which has far-reaching implications for all libraries.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Publishers' Viewpoint.

The single largest problem which any cataloging-in-publication program faces is that of gaining the co-operation of individual publishers. Unlike the Library of Congress, which may accept the greater part of the burden of a cataloging-in-publication program in its role as the national library, or the individual libraries, which will make use of the cataloging information supplied through CIP, the individual publishing firm has very little to motivate it to co-operate in a program. Nearly a century ago, within a year of the first suggestion for pre-publication cataloging, R.R. Bowker saw the problem quite clearly. In 1877, speaking at the annual meeting of the American Library Association, he pointed out:

> The difficulty in regard to obtaining the co-operation of the book trade would be that publishing books is a business and not philanthropy. It is desirable to approach publishers chiefly from the commercial side. They desire to see that there is money in it.[4]

This is essentially the same problem which faces Cataloging-in-Publication today.

Because book sales to libraries do represent a sizable portion of the revenues of most publishers, the publishing industry has no desire to alienate librarians by vigorously opposing an idea which has so long been cherished by librarians and the American Library Association. At the same time, CIP does not appear to offer any incentive to publishers which might insure their participation in the program. In 1968, libraries accounted for approximately 19% of the total book sales in the U.S. ($486 million of the $2.6 billion total).[5] More important than the fact that the publishing industry does not depend overwhelmingly on the library market is the realization on the part of the individual publisher that libraries are obligated to buy books without regard to the presence or absence of CIP entries in those books.

The 1960 report on Cataloging-in-Source pointed out some of the difficulties involved in acquiring the co-operation of publishers. In 1958, the Library of Congress approached over 300 publishers to ascertain if they would be willing to participate in the CIS experiment. Of these, 244 agreed to send in page proofs for one or more of their forthcoming books. However, when the project was terminated in 1959 only 157 publishers or something less than 52% of the more than 300 originally approached had submitted proofs for at least one book.[6] Perhaps more telling is the fact that in the post-experiment survey which the Library of Congress took of publishers in 1959 only 50 publishers expressed a willingness to continue in the program.[7] That is, something less than 16% of the more than 300 publishers approached had co-operated in Cataloging-in-Source and were willing to continue to do so. Furthermore, "co-operation" on the part of a publisher generally meant submitting a small percent of his total output. Of the 141 trade publishers who actually submitted

proofs (the remaining 16 publishers were U.S. Government agencies) only 12 submitted more than 14 books during the entire period. On the other hand, 106 publishers or about 75% submitted fewer than 7 books each.[8]

The types of books which publishers chose to send to the Library of Congress for cataloging-in-source also indicate something about the attitude of the industry toward the program. Individual publishers, realizing that some delay in their production schedules would be inevitable, tended to submit proofs for books which had not been assigned a high priority, rush schedule. This tendency was evident in the very small percent of CIS books which became bestsellers. Of the 136 titles which appeared on the lists of bestsellers in Publishers' Weekly during 1958-59 only 5 contained CIS entries.[9] Unfortunately, the books which publishers refused to submit for cataloging-in-source were the very books libraries were most interested in getting to their readers in the shortest possible time. If Cataloging-in-Publication is to achieve its objective of reducing the processing time for prime adult fiction and non-fiction, publishers must be persuaded to submit their more important titles for pre-publication cataloging.

The record of publisher co-operation in the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source project was a very poor one, and there is reason to suspect that their performance in the current Cataloging-in-Publication may be no better. One of the problems encountered by publishers in the 1958-59 program was the delay involved in sending the proofs to the Library of Congress. In the words of the 1960 report, "The interruption of production schedules was reported by a great majority of publishers as being a very real problem. Only a few firms experienced no difficulties of this sort."[10] If present plans are carried out, there will be considerably more delay involved in the new program than in 1958-59. In Cataloging-in-Source

the Library of Congress set a 24-hour time limit for cataloging a book. This emphasis on speed led, however, to some difficulties for the cataloging staff.

> The work was taxing because of the over-all time limit, the presence of the "rush" slip, the necessity for recording the exact amount of time spent, and the special difficulties involved in working with proofs and data sheets. These factors combined to produce a feeling of tension and considerably greater fatigue than in regular cataloging.[11]

To relieve the pressure on the cataloging staff the new program will operate under a one-week time limit rather than the previous 24-hour limit. This will no doubt relieve some of the tension for the catalogers, but a week-long delay may prove to be unacceptable to a majority of publishers.

It has been suggested that the only way to assure satisfactory publisher participation in a cataloging-in-publication program is to require their co-operation by force of law. K.A. Lodewycks offered this solution in 1953.[12] However, the record of cataloging-in-publication in the Soviet Union has demonstrated that even legal requirements will not necessarily insure success. In 1959, the Russian Ministry of Culture ordered publishers to include cataloging information in all books in certain classes. At the same time, the burden of cataloging was shifted to the publishers by requiring that the books be cataloged at the individual publishing houses by members of the publishers' staffs.[13] Even under these circumstances cataloging-in-publication has experienced difficulty. It was reported in 1970 that "after a decade of effort, the Soviet Union still has not achieved the comprehensive CIP program that is envisaged by American proponents of the plan."[14]

Supporters of cataloging-in-publication have for years (the first instance was in 1877)[15] argued that publishers would be willing to participate in a program because it would result in increased book sales.

The reasoning is that such a program would permit reductions in the cataloging staffs of most libraries and so would permit funds previously spent on cataloging to be spent for book purchases, thus resulting in increased revenues for the publishing industry. There are at least two questions which are raised by this argument. In the first place, it has never been demonstrated that cataloging-in-publication would actually reduce cataloging costs for individual libraries. There was no study conducted after the 1958-59 project to measure the effect that the 1,203 titles cataloged in the program had on the processing routines of libraries. The second fault in the argument results from its failure to look at cataloging-in-publication from the viewpoint of individual publishers. If indeed the program did result in increased book sales for the publishing industry, it would not offer incentives to individual publishers to include CIP entries in their books. Publishers will recognize the fact that libraries cannot base their book selection on the criterion of whether or not a book contains cataloging copy. Libraries will have to continue to purchase books for their collections without regard for cataloging-in-publication entries. To the individual publisher, this means that participation in the program will not necessarily result in increased book sales to libraries.

While there are other problems that Cataloging-in-Publication presents from the viewpoint of the publishing industry (such as cost, aesthetic considerations involving the appearance of a facsimile of a library card on the printed page, the objections to the printing of authors' real names in pseudonymous works, and the interruption of production schedules), the main difficulty is that Cataloging-in-Publication means to each publisher additional expense and additional problems while it offers him nothing in return.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of the Library of Congress.

The 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source experiment was not a happy experience for the Library of Congress. After eight months of the program there were still some publishers who were willing to continue to submit proofs for selected books, but the cataloging staff of the Library of Congress was nearly exhausted. The problems encountered in 1958-59 have, however, been valuable in planning for the current Cataloging-in-Publication program. A number of changes have been made in the new project in an effort to avoid some of the difficulties experienced in the earlier project.

Probably the most difficult aspect of Cataloging-in-Source for the Library of Congress was the pressure on the cataloging staff caused by the 24-hour "nonstop-rush" schedule. The 1960 report concluded that the catalogers "were unanimous in regarding this type of cataloging as unrewarding and taxing." [16] To eliminate this pressure CIP will operate on a one-week schedule. While this will undoubtedly reduce the pressure on the cataloging staff it is questionable if the publishers who complained of the delay involved in the 24-hour schedule will be able to tolerate the new one-week schedule.

Changes have also been made in the new program to reduce the percentage of discrepancies between the catalog entries and books, which was so high in 1958-59. Of the 1,082 titles published which contained cataloging copy, 615 or 57% of the entries contained one or more errors.[17] Many of the 615 entries contained more than one error, resulting in a total of 1,062 errors. Very close to one half of the errors (505 to be exact) occured in the collation. Errors in the imprint accounted for another 184 discrepancies. Because the greatest occurance of errors was in the imprint and collation, it has been decided that in CIP these statements will be omitted altogether.

Judging from the 1958-59 project this should reduce the rate of discrepancy from the 57% of the CIS experiment to approximately 20%. There has been some discussion of futher reducing this discrepancy rate by omitting all subtitles.[18] Additional omissions would of course serve to further decrease the error rate, but at the same time they would reduce the usefulness of the program. Carried to its logical conclusion, this process would result in no errors, but also in no entries. In any event, there will always be a fairly high rate of discrepancy in cataloging done from proofs. Alex Ladenson, writing in 1960, described the problem:

> The basic difficulty is that a book cannot be cataloged adequately until it has been endowed with all of the physical properties of a book. To attempt to catalog a book from galley or even page proofs is to ignore some of the fundamental bases of cataloging.[19]

To the Library of Congress, this means that it must, to all intents and purposes, catalog every book in the CIP program twice. The Library will first catalog a book from the proofs to prepare the CIP copy. After the book is published the Library will be faced with the task of preparing another, completely accurate, catalog entry for its own catalogs and for the production of Library of Congress cards to be sold through the Card Division. It is questionable if the CIP entry will be of much help in cataloging the book the second time. The discrepancy rate of the CIP entry will always be too high to permit a cataloger to accept any part of the entry without checking it carefully against the published book, and the omissions which are part of the current program will necessitate adding the collation and imprint in the second cataloging process.

The problems which Cataloging-in-Publication present for the Library of Congress are not as formidable on the whole as those which concern the publishing industry. It is the Library of Congress, however, which must, almost alone, bear the total cost of Cataloging-in-Publication. It must

be willing to increase its cataloging staff considerably in order to handle the double cataloging which CIP entails.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of Librarians.

The main purpose of any cataloging-in-publication program is, of course, to provide individual libraries with cataloging information for a particular book within that book. The simplest way to accomplish this is to have a facsimile of a Library of Congress card printed on the verso of the title page of each copy of a book selected for CIP. Ideally, this would enable each library receiving the book to produce a set of cards, using the cataloging information in the book as the master copy. In this way, the process of ordering and waiting for catalog cards could be eliminated, and the book could be processed immediately. There are, however, a number of obstacles which must be overcome if anything near this objective can be achieved.

The single factor which might have made cataloging-in-publication the panacea that some of its stronger advocates have claimed it to be is the elusive "cataloger's camera." This is a device which would photocopy the facsimile of a Library of Congress card appearing in a book and then produce a complete set of catalog cards from that photocopy. Until the present CIP project the idea of such a camera has been inseparably linked with the idea of pre-publication cataloging. The final report on the Cataloging-in-Source experiment saw the cataloger's camera as an integral part of the program:

> The underlying concept was that all books could be cataloged once and for all at some central point by standardized methods, and that libraries would transfer the catalog entries by means of a "cataloger's camera" from the books themselves to cards.... [20]

The idea of such a camera has been abandoned, at least for the foreseeable future, for a number of reasons. Most important is the fact that such a camera has not yet been developed. In addition, the 1958-59 experiment demonstrated that even if a satisfactory cataloger's camera could be developed, its use would be severely limited because of the high number of discrepancies between CIP entry and printed book. The current program has had to completely abandon the concept due to the omissions of collation and imprint from the entries. It would be necessary to add these items to the facsimile before a set of cards could be produced.

Lacking a method by which card sets could be produced directly from the CIP entries, the important questions become how and to what extent libraries will use Cataloging-in-Publication. Unfortunately, there was no study of the actual use made by libraries of the 1,082 entries which were printed in books during the 1958-59 experiment, and therefore there is no accurate measurement of the impact a CIP program might have on libraries. There have been a number of surveys taken with the intention of measuring the attitudes of librarians toward such programs, and as one would suspect these have shown that they are endorsed by a large majority of librarians. These surveys could hardly have come up with a different conclusion, since libraries will bear none of the expenses of a CIP program, but stand to reap all of its benefits. While the surveys have shown very little negative reaction on the part of librarians, there is some indication of a feeling of apathy toward the idea.

The often cited "Consumer Reaction Survey," which was taken in 1959 after the cessation of the Cataloging-in-Source project, reached the conclusion that "the vote for CIS was overwhelming approval, possibly as high as 98 or 99 percent." [21] A closer look at the survey shows that these

figures may be misleading. In the first place, the method of selecting the libraries to be surveyed raises some questions. Rather than sending the questionnaires to randomly selected libraries, the survey committee followed a different procedure:

> When the interview form settled down into its final shape, letters were sent to approximately 200 libraries to ask if they would cooperate with the Cataloging in Source project to the extent of granting interviews.... It was only after they consented that they saw the questionnaire.[22]

In effect, only librarians who expressed an interest in the program were surveyed. It is curious that an 100% expression of approval was not achieved using this method. More telling perhaps is the fact that 56% of the librarians stated that they would continue to purchase Library of Congress or Wilson cards for those books containing CIS entries.[23] It appears that while "98 or 99 percent" expressed approval of the program, only 44% intended to use it for its primary purpose: the preparation of card sets from CIS entries.

A more recent survey of librarians was taken in 1970 to measure their attitudes toward the new CIP project. Like the earlier survey, it concluded that "97% in all welcomed it."[24] Again, this indication of overwhelming enthusiasm may be misleading. The survey was conducted by mailing questionnaires to 391 libraries of all types. However, only 230 questionnaires were completed and returned.[25] This represents a 59% response. Of those responding, indeed 97% did express approval. The more important factor here, however, is the percentage of returns. By not taking the time to complete a questionnaire which consisted of 7 multiple-choice questions a librarian was at least expressing a degree of indifference, if not disapproval. If only 59% of all librarians in the U.S. are interested enough in Cataloging-in-Publication to take the time to return a questionnaire, the need for such a program may be doubtful.

More important than the attitudes of librarians toward CIP is the question of how the CIP entries will be utilized. With the elimination of the concept of the "cataloger's camera" which would produce card sets directly from CIP entries, librarians are faced with a rather limited range of options. Each CIP entry will have to be retyped onto card stock to prepare a master card from which a card set can be produced. It has been suggested that this is not a cataloging task, but is rather a clerical step.[26] However, the rate of discrepancy between the entries and the books will necessitate careful examination of every CIP entry. This, together with the tasks of retyping the partial CIP entry and the examination of the book itself to obtain the missing imprint and collation would appear to require a cataloger rather than a clerk. Because the missing information must be supplied as the master card is typed, it will probably be necessary for a cataloger to type the entire card. Perhaps the most economical method of producing card sets under these circumstances would require the use of an IBM Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST). A MT/ST would permit a cataloger to type a number of master cards onto a tape which could later be run off by a clerk to produce the card sets. Because of the increased typing time on the part of catalogers, utilization of CIP entries by a library may require an increase in its cataloging staff while permitting a reduction in its clerical staff.

Conclusions.

Any cataloging-in-publication program is made difficult by the fact that publishers, the Library of Congress, and the libraries which will use the entries must all co-operate and must find such a program consistent with their individual objectives. Publishers must be willing to include in their production schedules a step which will permit galley or page

proofs to be sent to the Library of Congress, and they must be willing to print in each copy of every title cataloged in the program the catalog card facsimile prepared by the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress must be willing to accept practically the entire expense of the program and must set up a department to rush catalog the titles submitted by publishers. The libraries which will use the CIP entries will have to demonstrate that the program is indeed as useful as has been claimed. If the publishers, or the Library of Congress, or the libraries find the program inconsistent with their objectives the program is destined to failure.

If the Cataloging-in-Publication program is to succeed it is important that as many of the inevitable problems be identified as early as possible. If many of the potential problems are not anticipated before they are actually encountered, and if solutions are not worked out in advance, it is likely the program will flounder before it is well under way. Cataloging-in-publication programs, in spite of a long record of failures, seem always to be approached by librarians with surprising optimism. The optimism surrounding the current program is very much in evidence in the recent journal articles which have appeared on the subject. A more critical attitude, especially on the part of those directly involved in the program, might, in the long run, mean the difference between the program's success or failure. The fact that any cataloging-in-publication program is fraught with problems should not be glossed over by the optimism of well-meaning librarians. The program would be better served by a more objective examination of the problems facing it.

References.

1. Jane Kaser, "The Venerable History of Cataloging-in-Source," Missouri Library Association Quarterly, XX (September, 1959), 76-7.

2. U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department., The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment (Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1960).

3. Ibid., pp. 47, 52.

4. American Library Association, "Proceedings of the Annual Conference," Library Journal, II (September, 1877), 33.

5. The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1970 (New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1970), pp. 22, 27.

6. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, pp. xix-xx.

7. Orcena Mahoney, "Cataloging in Source," ALA Bulletin, LIV (March, 1960), p. 200.

8. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, pp. 133-40.

9. "Cataloging in Source," The Library of Congress Cataloging Service Bulletin, No. 53 (June, 1959).

10. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 26.

11. Ibid., p. 18.

12. K.A. Lodewycks, "The Self-Cataloguing Book," Australian Library Journal, II (April, 1953), p. 33.

13. Eleanor Buist, "Soviet Centralized Cataloging: A View from Abroad," Library Trends, XVI (July, 1967), pp. 130-1.

14. Eleanor Buist, "Cataloging-in-Publication in the Soviet Union," The Library of Congress Information Bulletin, August 20, 1970, p. A-108.

15. Kaser, "The Venerable History of Cataloging-in-Source," p. 76.

16. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 18.

17. Ibid., p. 140.

18. Verner W. Clapp, "CIP in Mid-1970," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), p. 16.

19. "Cataloging-in-Source: A Symposium," Library Resources and Technical Services, IV (Fall, 1960), p. 274.

20. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. v.

21. Ibid., p. 58.

22. Virginia Drewry, "Consumer Reaction Survey of Cataloging in Source," Library Resources and Technical Services, III (Fall, 1959), p. 249.

23. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 70.

24. "Plan Presented for Cataloging-in-Source," Publishers' Weekly, October 5, 1970, p. 35.

25. Clapp, "CIP in Mid 1970," p. 17.

26. Joseph L. Wheeler, "Why We Must Have Cataloging in Publication," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), p. 9.

Henry W. Wingate